



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,695	01/23/2002	Bernhard Hauer	51241	8284

26474 7590 01/18/2008
NOVAK DRUCE DELUCA + QUIGG LLP
1300 EYE STREET NW
SUITE 1000 WEST TOWER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PAK, YONG D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/031,695

Applicant(s)

HAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Yong D. Pak

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a 371 of PCT/EP00/07252.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 31, 2007, adding claim 20, has been entered.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are pending. Claims 1-11 are withdrawn. Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are under consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment and arguments filed on October 31, 2007, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 12 and claims 14 and 16-18 depending therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 recites the phrase “is derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:”. The metes and bounds of this phrase in the context of the claims are not clear to the Examiner. Literally, while the term “derived” means “to isolate from or obtain from a source”, the above term could also mean “to arrive at by reasoning i.e., to deduce or infer” or also as “to produce or obtain from another substance”. Therefore, it is not clear to the Examiner either from the specification or from the claims as to what applicants mean by the above phrase. It is not clear to the Examiner whether the mutants of the monooxygenase “derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2” encompasses mutants of a single specific enzyme (SEQ ID NO:2), or whether it encompasses mutants of any monooxygenase, including (1) monooxygenase isolated from any other source and (2) any or all variants, mutants and recombinants of SEQ ID NO:2; and labeled as a monooxygenase “derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2”. As applicants have not provided a definition for the above phrase, Examiner has interpreted the claims broadly to mean that a monooxygenase “derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:” encompasses

polypeptides which are recombinants, variants or mutants of any monooxygenase.

Examiner has given the same interpretation while considering the claims for all other rejections.

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection.

Applicants argue that the phrase "derived from" as added to the claims in response to the Examiner's use of such phrase in the Office Action of October 6, 2003 and therefore, applicant is perplexed as to how the Examiner can now assert that said phrase is and/or would be unclear to a skilled artisan. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The above phrase was not coined by Examiner, but the above phrase is used in the specification.

The monooxygenases according to the invention are preferably
40 derived from cytochrome P450 monooxygenases from the enzyme class
E.C. 1.14.--, in particular from the P450 family CYP102, and are
of eukaryotic or prokaryotic, in particular bacterial, origin.

An especially preferred group of mutants is derived from *Bacillus*
45 *megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase BM-3 with an amino acid
sequence as shown in SEQ ID NO:2, which has at least one
functional mutation in one of the following amino acid sequence

Further, Examiner did not state that the above phrase is definite but used the phrase in interpreting the claims as broadly as possible. But more importantly, the instant rejection is based on the finding that the metes and bounds of this phrase in the context of the claims are not clear to the Examiner. Further, Examiner can introduce a new rejection at any time during prosecution.

Applicants also argue that Examiner has failed to consider the claim in its entirety because claim 12 cannot be reasonably be interpreted to encompass all polypeptide which are recombinants, variants or mutants of any monooxygenase since the claims must be read in light of the specification. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since (1) applicants have not provided a definition for the above phrase and (2) applicants in the previous Remarks (filed April 11, 2007) stated that the phrase is "not intended to refer to that fact that the sequence is limited to being physically isolated from *B. megaterium*, but rather... is intended to refer to the fact that the sequence is preferably based on the sequence of *B. megaterium*, and can contain functionally equivalent mutants, variants, etc. (For applicant's convenience, the portion of said Remarks is provided below.),

Applicant respectfully submits that the phrase "is derived from *Bacillus megaterium*" is not intended to refer to that fact that the sequence is limited to being physically isolated from *B. megaterium*, but rather, as described in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the specification, is intended to refer to the fact that the sequence is preferably based on the sequence of *B. megaterium*, and can contain functionally equivalent mutations, variants, etc.

Examiner has interpreted the claims broadly to mean that a monooxygenase "derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2" encompasses polypeptides which are recombinants, variants or mutants of any monooxygenase.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the phrase "as set forth in". The metes and bounds of the phrase in the context of the claims are not clear. It is not clear to the Examiner if the recited monooxygenase has the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 or is a representative member of a genus. Examiner suggests amending the phrase as "amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2" to clearly indicate that the monooxygenase has the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the phrase "if the enzyme carries mutation F87A, then there exists more than one functional mutation". The metes and bounds of the phrase in the context of the claims are not clear. It is not clear to the Examiner if the "more than one functional mutation" is selected from amino acids at positions 26, 47, 72, 74 or 354 or if the "more than one functional mutation" is selected from any amino acids which result in an altered activity or regioselectivity in the subterminal enzymatic hydroxylation of an aliphatic C8-C12-carboxylic acid or a derivative thereof. A perusal of the specification did not provide the Examiner with a specific definition for the above phrase. Therefore, it is not clear to the Examiner as to what mutants are encompassed in the above

phrase. Examiner requests clarification of the above phrase. For examination purposes, Examiner has broadly interpreted the above phrase as encompassing amino acids at positions 26, 47, 72, 74 or 354 and any other amino acids which result in an altered activity or regioselectivity in the subterminal enzymatic hydroxylation of an aliphatic C8-C12-carboxylic acid or a derivative thereof. Examiner has given the same interpretation while considering the claims for all other rejections.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are drawn to a method for the enzymatic production of subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids with (A) a cytochrome P450 monooxygenase derived from a *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase BM-3 with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2 or (B) a monooxygenase having an amino acid sequence according to SEQ ID NO:2, wherein said monooxygenase of (A) or (B) contains a functional mutation at position 87 and 188 and optionally at least one additional functional mutation at positions 26, 47, 72, 74 and 354.

It is noted that MPEP 2111.01 states that "[d]uring examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow." In this case, the limitation of "containing" or "contains" mutations at positions 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 provide no description on the structure of other parts of the mutant monooxygenase because (1) the claimed variant is not limited to only those mutations at positions 87, 188 and 26, 47, 72 and 354, and (2) the transitional term "containing" or "contains" is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements, such as mutations at other positions. Therefore, while the mutant monooxygenase comprises the recited mutations/substitutions, the same mutant comprises any amino acids in any other positions. Also, the examiner has broadly interpreted "an amino acid sequence according to SEQ ID NO:2" to encompass a fragment of as few as 2 contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2. Thus, claim 20 has been construed as meaning a method of using a mutant of a polypeptide comprising any fragment of SEQ ID NO:2 (as little as two contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO:). Therefore, Examiner has interpreted the claims broadly to encompass a method of using a polynucleotide encoding mutants of (A) any monooxygenase, including any monooxygenase isolated from any sources and including any or all variants, recombinants, and mutants thereof, or (B) any monooxygenase comprising any fragment of SEQ ID NO:2 (as little as two contiguous amino acids), wherein said mutant of (A) or (B) comprises of one or more amino acid mutation/substitution at amino acid positions corresponding to 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 of SEQ ID NO:2 and one or more amino acid mutation/substitutions at any other amino

acid positions. Therefore, the claims encompass a method for the production of subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids using a polynucleotide encoding mutant monooxygenase having any structure, except at the recited amino acids.

The specification only teaches a method for hydroxylating 15-para-nitrophenoxy-carboxylic acids (pNCA), 12-pNCA, 10-pNCA or 8-pNCA with a polynucleotide encoding a mutant of a cytochrome P450 monooxygenase of SEQ ID NO:2, wherein the mutant consists of mutations at position 26, 47, 74, 87, 188 and/or 354 of SEQ ID NO:2. These limited examples are not enough and does not constitute a representative number of species to describe the whole genus and there is no evidence on the record of the relationship between the structure of a modified cytochrome P450 monooxygenase of SEQ ID NO:2 consisting of substitutions at residues 26, 47, 74, 87, 188 and/or 354 of SEQ ID NO:2 and the structure of any recombinants, variants and mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 or any cytochrome P450 monooxygenase derived from SEQ ID NO:2. Therefore, the specification fails to describe a representative species of the genus comprising variants and mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 or any recombinants, variants and mutants of any cytochrome P450 monooxygenase, derived from SEQ ID NO:2 or from any source, used to produce subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids.

Given this lack of description of the representative species encompassed by the genus of the claims, the specification fails to sufficiently describe the claimed invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize that applicants were in possession of the inventions of claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at www.uspto.gov.

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection.

Applicants argue that Examiner has improperly interpreted the claims too broadly and has not given the instant claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification nor consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach since (1) claim 12 specification recites that the vector includes a monooxygenase derived from SEQ ID NO:2 and (2) a skilled artisan would readily recognize that "derived from SEQ ID NO:2" did not describe "a polynucleotide encoding mutants of any monooxygenase, including any monooxygenase isolated from any sources and including any or all variants, recombinants, and mutants thereof but that the claims are limited to a vector comprising SEQ ID NO:2 and functional equivalents thereof. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification does not provide a definition for the above phrase. According to MPEP 2111.01, since no explicit definition for the phrase was given in the specification, this phrase should be given its ordinary meaning and broadest reasonable interpretation and should not be limited to preferred embodiments in the specification (mutants of only SEQ ID NO:2.). Therefore, the claims remain as being interpreted broadly to mean that a monooxygenase "derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid

sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2" encompasses polypeptides which are recombinants, variants or mutants of any monooxygenase.

Applicants also argue that since the instant claims refer to a functional mutation, which is specifically defined in the specification, the Examiner cannot reasonably interpret the claims to contain all mutations, substitutions, at any amino acid position, and therefore, the instant claims are not drawn to polypeptides having "any structure". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the limitation of "containing" or "contains" functional mutations at positions 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 provide no description on the structure of other parts of the mutant monooxygenase because (1) the claimed variant is not limited to only those mutations at positions 87, 188 and 26, 47, 72 and 354, and (2) the transitional term "containing" or "contains" is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements, such as mutations at other positions. Therefore, while the mutant monooxygenase comprises the recited mutations/substitutions, the same mutant comprises any amino acids in any other positions. The genus comprising any or all recombinants, variants and mutants of any monooxygenase does not possess any common attributes other than having monooxygenase activity. Therefore, the specification lacks description of a representative number of species to describe the whole genus. As discussed in the written description guidelines, the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical

and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. **Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus.** Satisfactory disclosure of a representative number depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed. For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus. In the instant case the claimed genus used in the method includes species which are widely variant in structure. As such, the disclosure solely functional features present in all members of the genus is sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of enzymatic production of specific subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids by using a polynucleotide

encoding a mutant of a cytochrome P450 monooxygenase of SEQ ID NO:2, wherein the mutant consists of a substitution at positions 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72, 74 and 354 and using 15-para-nitrophenoxycarboxylic acids (pNCA), 12-pNCA, 10-pNCA or 8-pNCA as substrates, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for the production of any subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids using a polynucleotide encoding a mutant of SEQ ID NO:2 or any cytochrome P450 monooxygenase. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. (See rejection of "derived" under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph).

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claim(s).

Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are drawn to a method for the enzymatic production of subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids with (A) a cytochrome P450 monooxygenase derived from a *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase BM-3 with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2 or (B) a monooxygenase having an amino acid sequence according to SEQ ID NO:2, wherein said

monooxygenase of (A) or (B) contains a functional mutation at position 87 and 188 and optionally at least one additional functional mutation at positions 26, 47, 72, 74 and 354.

It is noted that MPEP 2111.01 states that "[d]uring examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow." In this case, the limitation of "containing" or "contains" mutations at positions 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 provide no description on the structure of other parts of the mutant monooxygenase because (1) the claimed variant is not limited to only those mutations at positions 87, 188 and 26, 47, 72 and 354, and (2) the transitional term "containing" or "contains" is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements, such as mutations at other positions. Therefore, while the mutant monooxygenase comprises the recited mutations/substitutions, the same mutant comprises any amino acids in any other positions. Also, the examiner has broadly interpreted "an amino acid sequence according to SEQ ID NO:2" to encompass a fragment of as few as 2 contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2. Thus, claim 20 has been construed as meaning a method of using a mutant of a polypeptide comprising any fragment of SEQ ID NO:2 (as little as two contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO:). Therefore, Examiner has interpreted the claims broadly to encompass a method of using a polynucleotide encoding mutants of (A) any monooxygenase, including any monooxygenase isolated from any sources and including any or all variants, recombinants, and mutants thereof, or (B) any monooxygenase comprising any fragment of SEQ ID NO:2 (as little as two contiguous amino acids), wherein said mutant of (A) or (B) comprises of one or more amino acid mutation/substitution at amino acid

positions corresponding to 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 of SEQ ID NO:2 and one or more amino acid mutation/substitutions at any other amino acid positions. Therefore, the claims encompass a method for the production of subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids using a polynucleotide encoding mutant monooxygenase having any structure, except at the recited amino acid positions.

The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of P450 monooxygenase variants and mutants, broadly encompassed by the claims. The claims encompass compounds with widely varying structure and properties. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to a method for hydroxylating 15-para-nitrophenoxycarboxylic acids (pNCA), 12-pNCA, 10-pNCA or 8-pNCA with a polynucleotide encoding a mutant cytochrome P450 monooxygenase of SEQ ID NO:2, wherein the mutant consists of mutations at residue 26, 47, 74, 87, 188 or 354 of SEQ ID NO:2.

Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to a method for hydroxylating 15-para-nitrophenoxycarboxylic acids (pNCA), 12-pNCA, 10-pNCA or 8-pNCA with a

polynucleotide encoding a mutant cytochrome P450 monooxygenase of SEQ ID NO:2, wherein the mutant consists of mutations at residue 26, 47, 74, 87, 188 or 354 of SEQ ID NO:2. It would require undue experimentation of the skilled artisan to make the claimed variants and mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 or any P450 monooxygenases and use the claimed variants and mutants of any P450 monooxygenase to produce any subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids. In view of the great breadth of the claim, amount of experimentation required to make and use the polynucleotides in the claimed method, the lack of guidance, working examples, and unpredictability of the art in predicting function from a polypeptide primary structure, the claimed invention would require undue experimentation. As such, the specification fails to teach one of ordinary skill how to use the full scope of the polynucleotides encompassed by the claimed method.

While enzyme isolation techniques, recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, and it is routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications as encompassed by the instant claims, the specific amino acid positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass a method for the enzymatic production of subterminally hydroxylating

aliphatic carboxylic acids using any or all mutants and variants of SEQ ID NO:2 or any P450 monooxygenase, because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the substrate binding region of SEQ ID NO:2 or any P450 monooxygenase which may be modified without affecting P450 monooxygenase activity or having an altered substrate profile (except at the recited amino acid positions); (B) the general tolerance of P450 monooxygenase to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino acid residue with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function except at the recited amino acid positions); (D) aliphatic carboxylic acids which are subterminally hydroxylated with any P450 monooxygenases; (E) a rational and predictable scheme for selecting aliphatic carboxylic acids with an expectation of obtaining a subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids by incubating said substrates with any P450 monooxygenase; and (F) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including a method for the production of subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids using any or all variants and mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 or any P450 monooxygenase. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of mutants and variants of any P450 monooxygenase having the desired biological characteristics recited in the

claim is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection.

Applicants argue that the Examiner bases the instant rejection on an improper construction of the phrase "derived from *Bacillus megaterium*," to incorrectly imply that the claims encompass a method of producing "any subterminally hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids using a polynucleotide encoding a mutant of any cytochrome P450 monooxygenase". Because a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the claims were substantially limited to gene constructs/vectors/organisms, etc. comprising SEQ ID NO:2 and functional equivalents thereof. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed, above, the specification does not provide a definition for the above phrase. According to MPEP 2111.01, since no explicit definition for the phrase was given in the specification, this phrase should be given its ordinary meaning and broadest reasonable interpretation and should not be limited to preferred embodiments in the specification (mutants of only SEQ ID NO:2.). Therefore, the claims remain as being interpreted broadly to mean that a monooxygenase "derived from *Bacillus megaterium* cytochrome P450 monooxygenase with an amino acid sequence comprising SEQ ID NO:2" encompasses polypeptides which are recombinants, variants or mutants of any monooxygenase used in a method of producing any hydroxylated aliphatic carboxylic acids.

Applicants also argue that since the instant claims refer to a functional mutation, which is specifically defined in the specification, the Examiner cannot reasonably interpret the claims to contain all mutations, substitutions, at any amino acid position, and therefore, the instant claims are not drawn to polypeptides having "any structure". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the limitation of "containing" or "contains" functional mutations at positions 87 and 188 and optionally at positions 26, 47, 72 and 354 provide no description on the structure of other parts of the mutant monooxygenase because (1) the claimed variant is not limited to only those mutations at positions 87, 188 and 26, 47, 72 and 354, and (2) the transitional term "containing" or "contains" is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements, such as mutations at other positions. Therefore, while the mutant monooxygenase comprises the recited mutations/substitutions, the same mutant comprises any amino acids in any other positions.

Applicants also argue that the Examiner has failed to apply the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims that is consistent with the specification because since the claimed mutant monooxygenase requires at least the specific mutations recited in the claims, the mutant monooxygenase cannot comprise "any structure". Examiner respectfully disagrees. The only "structure" recited by the claims is that the mutant monooxygenase has (1) a Val, Ala or Leu at position 87 and Asn, Gln, ARg, Lys, Ala, Gly, Ser or Trp at position 188 or (2) Val, Ala or Leu at position 87 and Asn, Gln, ARg, Lys, Ala, Gly, Ser or Trp at position 188 and two contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2. Two to Four amino acids out of almost 1000 amino acids (SEQ ID NO:2 has

1048 amino acids) amounts to 0.2 to 0.4% of the whole structure of a given monooxygenase and therefore, Examiner has construed the claims as having no structure.

Applicants also argue that the ordinary skilled artisan would be quite capable of making and using the claimed invention and no undue experimentation is required to arrive at the instant invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims are not only drawn to mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 comprising the recited substitutions, but any mutants of any monooxygenase "derived" from SEQ ID NO:2 or "derived" from any monooxygenases isolated from any or all source, including any or all mutants, variants and recombinants thereof, comprising the recited substitutions. As discussed above, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a specific knowledge of and guidance with regard to which specific amino acids in the protein's sequence, can be modified such that the modified polypeptide continues to have said claimed activity. It is this specific guidance that applicants do not provide. Without specific guidance, those skilled in the art will be subjected to undue experimentation of making and testing each of the enormously large number of mutants that results from such experimentation. While the art may teach in general the structure of P450 monooxygenase, conserved amino acid sequences, and etc, such teachings will not reduce the burden of undue experimentation on those of ordinary skill in the art.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Claims 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0935. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



Yong D. Pak
Primary Patent Examiner 1652